Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

PROFESSOR BOLLING AND HOMERIC ABSTRACTS

In *Classical Philology* for October, 1919, Professor Bolling replies to my arguments in which I assumed (*Classical Philology* for April, 1919) that the statistics for abstracts given by Croiset were remotely connected with the work of Geppert. Everything to which Professor Bolling puts his hand bears the stamp of careful scholarship, but this adds to scholarship the rare gift of divination, since he knows the French which Croiset should have written, yet did not, "Had Croiset printed 'qui appartiennent à l'*Iliade* propre' his meaning would have been perfectly clear" (p. 329, n. 2). Professor Bolling proves that when Croiset discussed one formation of the abstracts he used the word *Iliade* as covering but part of the poem, "if we understand the *Iliad* to mean not the vulgate text but that poem with ΘΙΚΨΩ excluded" (p. 335), but that when he discussed on that same page another formation of abstracts he used the word "Iliad" in the sense of the entire vulgate text, "Here Croiset's figures are correct for the entire *Iliad*" (p. 335). Finally he shows that when on this same page Croiset made a summary he was totally lost, so lost that he not only excluded the five books named above but actually did not know that he had excluded them, so that he counted the abstracts in these five books, found they numbered nineteen, then subtracted this nineteen from a total in which these five books had never had a part, "In a moment of forgetfulness Croiset fancied that 58 was the total for the whole *Iliad* and subtracted from it the nineteen words which occur in ΘΙΚΨΩ but not in the other books of the *Iliad*" (p. 337).

After admitting these errors, errors far more humiliating to any scholar than anything I had suggested, he naïvely adds, "It will be, I trust, impossible to argue hereafter that Croiset was incompetent to compile such statistics" (p. 337).

In my article I had expressed the belief that Croiset's errors were due to Geppert in part, but not all, since Geppert cannot be charged with adding 12, 8, 38 and reaching a total of 39, nor can he, like Croiset, be accused of having no definite conception of what he himself meant by the word "Iliad."

The proof of the connection between Geppert and Croiset is too cogent to admit of doubt, and is as follows: Croiset (p. 369), "La terminaison σύνη est représentée dans la langue homérique par vingt-six mots; sur ce nombre, il y

en a six qui appartiennent en propre à l'*Iliade*, et quatorze qui ne figurent que dans l'*Odyssée*." This can only mean that the *Iliad* has twelve of these abstracts, for they have six fn common, the *Odyssey* twenty, while in truth the *Iliad* has not less than seventeen, the *Odyssey* not less than twenty-three.

How did he come by the number twelve for the *Iliad* and the number twenty for the *Odyssey?* Geppert (pp. 85–86) gives a list of these abstracts; first he says "Davon hat die *Iliade*," then he gives twelve abstracts in *σύνη*, after which he takes up the *Odyssey*, as if he had ended with the *Iliad*, and adds "die *Odyssee* hat eigenthümlich," followed by a list from the *Odyssey*. Here the presumption is that we have the source of the first error in Croiset, but Professor Bolling has set up an alternative; so I waive for the present my argument.

When we add up all the abstracts of this formation in Geppert for the *Odyssey* we shall find that we have twenty of them, and if we take up the *Odyssey* itself we shall find that Geppert has excluded intentionally or accidentally from this list three other examples: ι 509, *μαντοσύνη*; π 233, *ὑποθημοσύνη*; and ω 40, *ἱπποσύη*. Yet he does not say he has omitted them, and the fact that he did not mention them misled Croiset into thinking that twenty is all there are, so he places the number at twenty, or just the number given by Geppert. Hence we have both Geppert and Croiset assigning twelve abstracts of this formation to the *Iliad*, when there are at least seventeen, and both assigning twenty to the *Odyssey*, when there are at least twenty-three.

On the page just before the one in which Croiset discussed the abstracts he has this argument (p. 368): "On a remarqué qu' elle (la qualification *ἠύς τε μέγας τε*) revenait vingt-cinq fois dans l'*Iliade*, et trois fois seulement dans l'*Odyssée*." Professor Gildersleeve said once to his students that "statistical studies were in scholarship the same thing as paying cash in business"; but simply giving the totals, so that one cannot verify them without reading the poem, is not paying cash but indulging in the most inflated sort of credit. By studying the *Iliad* I find that it has this phrase, not twenty-five times, but only eight. The references are as follows, B 653, Γ 167, 226, E 628, Z 8, Λ 221, Υ 457, Ψ 664. Croiset in a footnote refers these figures to Professor Collitz. It seemed to me beyond belief that this competent scholar had made such an error, so I turned to the passage quoted, confident that no such figures would be given by him. Here is what Professor Collitz really said: "The adjective *ἠύς* is found only in certain cases and in formal expressions, such as *μένος ἠύ*, *ἠύς τε μέγας τε*." Then he gives a footnote in which he tables all the various uses of that adjective, and closes by saying that there are twenty-five examples of this word in the nominative and accusative in the *Iliad*. He gives absolutely no statistics of any kind for the phrase *ἠύς τε μέγας τε*.

I surmised that Croiset had not read Geppert, but had arrived at some of Geppert's figures through an intermediate source, but Croiset is nearer to Geppert whom he does not mention than he is to Collitz whom he assumes to quote.

I cannot end this part of my note better than by quoting the last sentence of Professor Bolling's: "It will be, I trust, impossible to argue hereafter either that Croiset was incompetent to compile such statistics, or that 'he was taking over what he assumed was the correct figures of another and publishing them as his own.'"

These are my reasons for believing that Croiset's statistics are in some way connected with the work done by Geppert. They seem conclusive to me, but whether my assumption is true or not is of no moment in its bearing on the authorship of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The important thing is that Croiset's statistics are false; the source of his errors is of trifling importance.

Whether Croiset meant to modify "*Iliade*" with the phrase "en propre" or not, those who have quoted him have never added any qualifying word, at least none whom I have seen, as for example: Van Leeuwen, Mnemosyne xxxviii. 382, Croiset docuit nomina in *σύνη, τυς, ίη* exeuntia Iliadem habere 39, Odysseam 81. Cauer, Grundfragen, 393, Croiset hat beobachtet, dass Substantive auf *-ίη, -σύνη, -τύς* die Ilias 39 hat, die Odyssee 81. So also in Christ-Schmid, and, what is the most convincing of all, Croiset gave the same thing in his own footnote.

You could hardly pass a severer criticism on any work of sober erudition than to say that it is written in language so obscure and so contradictory that not only such eminent scholars as those just quoted were unable to grasp it, but even the author himself, when he wrote the footnote, had no comprehension of his own meaning.

If we take Professor Bolling's own argument that Croiset by the "Iliade" meant but 19 books, then we reach the astounding conclusion that 19 books of the *Iliad* have 58 abstracts, and 24 books of the *Odyssey* have 81, hence the average for both poems is three and a small fraction per book, therefore they cannot belong to the same period because of their great diversity in the use of abstracts.

However there is one thing in Professor Bolling's article of the greatest importance, a thing which he has overlooked, and which constitutes an overwhelming argument for Homeric unity, since every argument advanced against that unity rests on the assumption that contradictions and inconsistencies make the notion of unity impossible. But here we have that theory utterly exploded, for Professor Bolling assumes in this work of undoubted unity, a work not of the imagination but of sober scholarship, a work of an author still living, that the word "Iliade" is used three times on the same page in totally different and contradictory meanings.

If he had been true to the rules of Homeric criticism Professor Bolling would have said that the first sentence was written by the original author, *der Ur-Verfasser*, the second sentence by the arranger, *der Bearbeiter*, and the footnote by a simpleton, *der Flickverfasser*.

By admitting the unity of authorship in the face of his own theories of the contradictory meanings of the word "Iliade" in this one page of Croiset,

Professor Bolling demolishes the entire chorizontic edifice, an edifice with gaudy towers but with no foundations.

While I am delighted to have the arguments of so eminent a scholar that contradictions furnish no proof of diversity of authorship, yet I have an uncanny feeling that somehow we have opened the floodgates, and I should grieve beyond measure if our little discussion should create a new science, a science which might be simply named *Die wissenschaftlichen Erforschungen und Erkundigungen der Ursprünge und der Quellen der Irrtümer in der homerischen Kritik.*

The matter then at issue between us is the proper scientific classification of Croiset's errors, since Professor Bolling regards them as original, *ursprüngliche Irrtümer*, while I regard them as partially due to another, *abgeleitete Irrtümer*. However in a new science one does not have the nomenclature nicely to distinguish the various categories.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

TRANSLATIONS AND TRANSLATORS

The question of "trots" is more or less interesting to all language teachers. Some hunt "ponies" unrelentingly, others protest at intervals, most, perhaps, ignore the matter unless it is insolently forced upon their attention. How old this question was and how thoughtfully it had been canvassed we were not aware until we turned up a discussion dating from the early eighteenth century which may prove as fresh and interesting to some of our readers as it did to us.

Mr. John Clarke flourished in England around 1735. From his pen came a number of editions of the Latin classics, equipped with translations in parallel columns, some of which are characterized by the author as "literal" and others as "free." The former had the author's peculiar love and pains and, what constitutes his special claim to being an educational innovator, were designed to be placed directly in the hands of young Latin students to aid them in preparing their daily tasks. Not from low commercial motives. No, Mr. Clarke aims to promote speed, accuracy, and better English; he pleads with Lucretian earnestness to abolish the dictionary *superstitio*. His ideas and ideals are treated at length in the preface to his "literal" translation of Justin, from which we wish to excerpt a part.

"Supposing they (the boys) might make a hard Shift to do their Business in a poor blundering Manner by a Dictionary (which is the utmost any one of the least Knowledge in these Matters can suppose) yet what Occasion can there be for this? When it is to the last degree visible, their Business may be more easily and effectually done by the Help of Literal Translations. Is it not vastly more eligible for a Boy, when he is at a Stand for want of the proper Order or Meaning of Words, to be set a going immediately by one single Cast of his Eye, than to be obliged to spend Time in